

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 316 893

CS 507 071

AUTHOR Younger, Jan J.; Meussling, Vonne
TITLE Contemporary Oratory: A Lens for Our Time.
PUB DATE Nov 89
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (75th, San Francisco, CA, November 18-21, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Civil Rights; Discourse Analysis; Modern History; Persuasive Discourse; Public Speaking; *Rhetorical Criticism; *Speeches; United States History
IDENTIFIERS Allen (James E Jr); Malcolm X; *Orators; *Oratory; Rhetorical Strategies

ABSTRACT

Using rhetorical and historical approaches, this paper examines speech excerpts of four speakers active during the civil rights movement in the United States in the late 1960s and early 1970s. The paper's first section discusses Malcolm X and a speech delivered two months before his assassination; the second section studies James Allen speaking on school desegregation in his capacity as United States Commissioner of Education. The civil rights oratory of Father James Groppi of Milwaukee is examined in the third section, and the fourth section analyzes the speeches of the civil rights activist and Georgia legislator, Julian Bond. Fifty-nine notes are included. (SR)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED316893

Contemporary Oratory: A Lens for Our Time

Jan J. Younger
Department of Communication & Theatre Arts
Heidelberg College
Tiffin, Ohio 44883

&

Vonne Meussling
Department of Communication
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

Paper Presented at the Annual Convention
of the
Speech Communication Association
San Francisco, California

November 18-21, 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

JAN J. YOUNGER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Contemporary Oratory: A Lens for Our Time

In a recent work entitled Eloquence in An Electronic Age, Kathleen Hall-Jamieson commented on the study of speech as a part of education. Pointing to the alienation of speech-communication, Hall-Jamieson bemoaned, "Dismissed in the classroom, devalued by the media, divorced from the disciplines that develop the habits of the mind that are its mainstay, eloquence is orphaned."¹ Clearly, the study of speech should not exist and cannot endure as an orphan. Instead, eloquence draws its strength from historical tradition, defines itself through the richness of oral language, and measures its effect in the national mood, era, or consciousness of the times.

The study of contemporary American oratory was a unique course in the graduate program at Bowling Green State University. It was not an orphan. It was parented by Dr. Raymond Yeager and its family consisted of hundreds of graduate students.

The purpose of this study is to capture the spirit of this course by illustrating the kinds of rhetorical and historical studies of four speakers active during this period of the civil rights movement, and to offer a review of selected educational objectives of this specific course in light of current research concerning contemporary oratory.

Spirit of Course

The spirit of the course attempted to capture the voices of the late sixties and early seventies in America. Although the approach employed the traditional rhetorical studies of speaker,

situation, speech, and the effects of the speech, the spirit of the course encouraged varied and creative implementation of rhetorical methods. In illustrating the creative spirit of this course, the present writers will focus on four speakers who played a role in the civil rights movement in the United States during this time period. The first will be a Malcolm X speech two months before his assassination, the second will be a study of James Allen speaking on school desegregation as United States Commissioner of Education, the third will be the civil rights oratory of Father Groppi, and finally the fourth will be an analysis of the civil rights speaker, Julian Bond. These speakers represent a mix of rhetorical perspectives, strategies, and arguments within the civil rights movement.

Malcolm X

El-Hajj Malik El Shabazza, better known as Malcolm X, was an inspirational orator for the black nationalist movement in the 1960s. In pointing to his current rhetorical influence and sudden demise, Vera McCruiter wrote:

Malcolm X influenced millions of people with his ideas on socioeconomics, but he did not live long enough to see his dream of a more socially equal black society come into being.²

Malcolm X was shot to death at the Audobon Ballroom in New York on February 21, 1965. Rhetorical Problem. Although Malcolm X had built a reputation as a perceptive, fiery, and militant

orator, it was argued that Malcolm X moves close to the non-violent principles of Martin Luther King. In attempting to place Malcolm X in perspective in the oratory of the human rights movement, Donald Smith wrote:

In earlier speeches Malcolm played many variations on the theme of evil white, blue eyed devils and the necessity for black separatism. Toward the end of his life, however, Malcolm has broken with the Muslims and had formed his own black nationalist group.³

Following this schism with the Muslims, Malcolm made a lengthy trip through the Arab world, climaxed with a pilgrimage to Mecca. "As a result of these experiences," Smith wrote, "Malcolm began to accept the possibility that some white people are worthwhile, and philosophically, he moved a good deal closer toward Martin Luther King's beloved society."⁴ In furthering Malcolm's movement toward King's philosophy, Smith pointed to the fact that Malcolm X had joined King in a Selma march.

Rhetorical Artifact

Although Donald Smith wrote of this movement of Malcolm X, the rhetoric of Malcolm X did not reflect this movement in philosophy. The specific rhetorical artifact examined was a speech delivered at a Harlem campaign rally for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. Of three hundred persons attending the rally, about one-third of them were reported to be white. Malcolm X spoke after Fannie Lou Hamer and after Student

Nonviolent Coordinating Committee's Freedom Singers had presented various songs.

Major Premise: If a Mau Mau obtained freedom for
 the black man in Kenya, then a Mau
 Mau will obtain freedom in
 Mississippi.

Minor Premise: A Mau Mau did obtain freedom in
 Kenya.

Conclusion: A Mau Mau will obtain freedom in
 Mississippi.

Although Malcolm did not present this concept as a formal hypothetical syllogism, it was felt the logical development of this idea was effective for two reasons. First, Malcolm's historical parallel pointed to the factor of cultural identity shared by the speaker and the majority of the audience. Second, the historical parallel was a direct reference to a freedom song which was sung preceding Malcolm's speech.

The logical appeal that appeared to most radically find him in opposition to Martin Luther King's philosophy also took the form of a hypothetical enthymeme and was, again, rhetorically effective.

Major Premise: If the black man speaks the
 language of the white man, then the
 black man will have meaningful
 communication with the white man.

Minor Premise: The black man has not had
 meaningful communication with the
 white man.

Conclusion: The black man has not spoken the
 language of the white man.

Although Malcolm did not present this concept as a formal hypothetical syllogism, it was felt the logical development of this idea was effective for three reasons. First, Malcolm used the enthymeme as a repetitive device to clarify his position. This repetitive device was varied and effectively handled, when Malcolm stated:

And when you and I begin to look at him and see the language he speaks, the language of a brute, the language of someone who has no sense of morality, who absolutely ignores law--when you and I learn how to speak his language, then we can communicate.

The third reason it was felt Malcolm's logical arrangement was effective was because of the references to the audience's interests. Malcolm appealed to the audience interests in support of the second major idea when he stated: "If they don't want to deal with the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, (then) we'll give them something else to deal with. If they don't want to deal with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, we'll give them another alternative." The Mississippi Democratic Party

and the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee were organizations familiar to this audience.

Although the logical basis of the speech showed a marked conflict with the writings of King, the personal and emotional appeals reflected some Christian concerns. Throughout the body of the speech, Malcolm used a number of personal appeals. In an attempt to build his image as a "good and worthy" person, Malcolm equates himself with the "good and worthy" concepts of freedom, justice, and equality. Malcolm stated: "I'm for anybody who's for freedom. I'm for anybody who's for justice. I'm for anybody who's for equality." In a second attempt to build his image as a "good and worthy person," Malcolm artistically used the Christ image as an ethical proof justifying his position. Malcolm commented: "I know I'm in church, I probably shouldn't be talking like this--but Jesus himself was ready to turn the synagogue inside out and upside down when things weren't going right." Combining his artistic use of the Christ image with an ethical appeal "as a man well versed in Biblical readings," Malcolm further justifies his position:

In fact, in the book of Revelations, they've got Jesus sitting on a horse with a sword in his hand, getting ready to go into action. . . .They only tell you and me about the peaceful Jesus. . .No, go and read the whole book, and when you get to Revelation, you'll find that even Jesus' patience ran out.

In continuing to effectively equate his cause with the Biblical laws of justice, Malcolm stated: "And the law of justice is 'As ye sow, so shall ye reap' and the law of justice is 'He who kills by the sword shall be killed by the sword.'"

Malcolm attempted to enhance his image as an intelligent speaker with reference to his understanding of the American revolution and a reference to his travel. In enhancing his image as a speaker with a reference to his understanding of the American Revolution, Malcolm X stated:

Your own Patrick Henry said 'liberty or death' and George Washington got the cannons out, and the rest of them that you taught me to worship as my heroes, they were fighters, they were warriors.

Malcolm X furthers his image as an intelligent and well-traveled person when he states: "When I was in Africa, I noticed some of the Africans got their freedom faster than others."

Although Malcolm only briefly refers to his travels, he used his travel experience to effectively enhance his personal observations.

One of the final ethical appeals used by Malcolm X was contained in the conclusion of his speech. Malcolm attempted to have the audience follow his ideas and go down in history as "doing an honorable thing."

Rhetorical Conclusions

Malcolm's speech delivered two months before his death bristled with militancy. It showed little evidence of his moving closer to Dr. Martin Luther King's philosophy. The use of syllogistic reasoning helped establish a clear and logical frame of reference for Malcolm's arguments. His personal and emotional appeals seem to provide a basis of legitimacy for his actions as well as for the audience's actions. The speech was delivered at a rally. The message appeared to be one delivered by a fiery militant, not by a follower of Dr. Martin Luther King.

Rhetorical Problem

The public speaking of James E. Allen, Jr. occurred in the context and controversy of contemporary American history. It was a time of uncertain passage. The rhetorical setting for Allen's speaking encompassed three controversial exigencies including the urban crisis, the civil rights movement and campus unrest. During Allen's tenure as United States Commissioner of Education, three rhetorical imperatives compelled him to speak to these exigencies. School integration served as a rhetorical imperative for his speaking on civil rights, the Cambodian crisis served as a rhetorical imperative for his speaking on urban education. The major focus of this paper, will consider Allen's mandate to speak on civil rights.

The Exigence: Civil Rights

In the early 1960s the nation was a participant-observer as Martin Luther King, Jr. and his followers sought to bring down the racial barriers existing in the United States. When King spoke his "dream" from the Lincoln Memorial in August 1963, 200,000 blacks and whites were present and millions of others witnessed the event on nationwide television. It was possible at the time for many to believe that the "dream" would not be long in being realized.

The legislative support for the Civil Rights movement began more than five years before King's famous address. The energies and attention of civil rights groups in Congress resulted in five major legislative acts from 1957 to 1968. Passed in 1957, the first of these major acts was primarily designed to (1) create a Civil Rights commission, (2) set up a Civil Rights division in the Department of Justice, and (3) prohibit action that would prevent persons from voting in a federal election. The 1960 Civil Rights Act was a direct outgrowth of the 1957 Act. It contained six major titles and its primary thrust was to strengthen the provisions of the 1957 Act with specific penalties. Clearly, this generic legislation provided impetus for Martin Luther King's "dream." The third major act actually came in the wake of King's address. The Civil Rights Act of 1964

was a massive legislative move to reduce discrimination. After seventy-four days of Senate debate, the bill with eleven major titles passed 71-29. It prohibited discrimination in public accommodations and in programs receiving federal assistance. The fourth major legislative act was the Voting Rights Act of 1965. It authorized the Attorney General to appoint federal examiners to register voters in areas of marked discrimination and to strengthen penalties for interference with voters' rights. The Civil Rights Act of 1968 prohibited discrimination in the sale or rental of housing. The Act was the first open-housing law of the twentieth century.

By the end of 1970--about fifteen years after the famous Montgomery boycott, seven years after King's Lincoln Memorial address, and two years after King's assassination--the legislative chapter of civil rights appeared to close.

Rhetorical Imperative: Integration of Schools

Although federal legislation indirectly encouraged the movement for civil rights in education, it was the Supreme Court that provided much of the momentum for educational change in the 1960s. In a series of strongly worded opinions included in *Griffin v. Board of Education*, 377 U.S. 218m 234 (1964), *Green v. County Board of New Kent County*, 391 U.S. 430, 438-439, 422 (1968), and *Alexander v. Holmes County Board of Education*, 396 U.S. 19 (1969), the Supreme Court made it clear that it wanted no further delay in implementing the famous *Brown v. Board of*

Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954). The Alexander decision was the first major judgement Chief Warren Burger rendered after he joined the court. In the decision, the Court unanimously ruled that the "with all deliberate speed" formula was no longer constitutionally permissible. The order declared: "the obligation of every school district is to terminate segregated school systems at once and to operate now and hereafter only unitary schools."⁶ Although the decision stated the blunt principle of the law, it left to the lower courts, HEW and the Justice Department the task of sorting out what should, under the law, be considered instant integration. By November, HEW announced that it would try to impose a December 31 deadline date. This was in striking contrast to Attorney-General Mitchell's decision to refuse to set any dates. The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals attempted delay. In December, it set September 1970 as a desegregation deadline for the public schools in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi and Texas. However, the Supreme Court overturned the Court of Appeals deadline. The Supreme Court declared: "In so far as the Court of Appeals authorized deferral of student desegregation beyond February 1, 1969, that court misconstrued our holding in Alexander v. Holmes County Board of Education."⁷ Thus, the Supreme Court reaffirmed their October 29 decision ordering desegregation "at once."

Pointing to the significance of the situation, the Dallas

Times Herald editorially claimed:

What is happening these days on the segregation front could be the most significant development since the Supreme Court in 1954 declared segregated schools unconstitutional. Assuredly, it is more significant than anything which has happened since Congress passed the 1964 Civil Rights Act.⁸

The legal aim of the civil rights movement pointed directly at the integration of American schools. This legal concentration mandated a continual dialogue with HEW and the Office of Education.

Rhetorical Artifacts

Although the controversy concerning the conflict between Allen's views on civil rights and the Nixon-Agnew views on civil rights seemed to surface throughout Allen's appointment as United States Commissioner, there are two rhetorical artifacts that may be considered typical. The first occurred minutes after his appointment as United States Commissioner of Education in the Fish Room of the White House in a prepared statement, while the record occurred only six days after Allen's appointment on the nationally televised program entitled "Meet The Press."

Because of Allen's reputation as "Mr. Busing", his appointment speech was deemed important. He did not fail. The civil rights movement continued to drive toward school integration. Allen stated that he believed strongly in school

desegregation and favored busing students if it meant that this would get them better education. Emphatically, Allen declared:

When confronted with an issue that has such deep emotional and social impact, it is natural to seek the easiest and least disruptive means of dealing with it. But with the issues of desegregation and integration, it is inescapably evident that, when considered in fundamental terms, there is no way, no argument as to means, no sophistry or evasion whereby the principle of equality of educational opportunity can be made to accommodate the continuing existence of segregated schools in a democratic society--no matter how difficult the problem involved in eliminating them may be.⁹

Allen strongly advocated the principle of equality of educational opportunity throughout his term as U.S. Commissioner. The news media and Allen's southern opposition knew that President Nixon had campaigned on the platform "The purpose is education. I oppose busing because I'm for education. When you pick up children and cart them across town, you don't help their education. You hurt them."¹⁰ Only six days after Allen's appointment, Paul Duke of NBC News pointed to an apparent Allen-Nixon difference in the nationally televised "Meet The Press" program. The exchange follows:

Mr. Duke: President Nixon said during the campaign that

he opposed school busing and you are one of the foremost advocates of school busing in the country. Do you still favor busing?

Dr. Allen:

Sixteen million students in this country ride school buses every day so we have to have school busing. Busing is a means to an end. It is to get a child safely to a better education than he otherwise might have, and that is the only justification for busing. Way back in West Virginia, I remember in the 1930s when we had one-room schools and we found these schools were no longer adequate, we sent buses up the hollows to bring children out of these hollows into consolidated schools where they could have a better educational opportunity, then they supported busing. Indeed, they asked the buses to come right to their homes more and more. It is the same problem today. What we are trying to do is remove the barriers to equality of opportunity, and if busing is the only way to do it, then I would bus.

Mr. Duke: In other words, you still favor school busing to achieve greater racial balance in certain circumstances.

Dr. Allen: But not solely for that purpose. It is for the purpose of improving the education of a boy and a girl. I happen to believe that an integrated setting is a better setting for a good education."¹¹

Perception of Allen's dissent with the Nixon administration's position was not limited to the press. Following a meeting of Dr. Allen with leaders in the Nixon administration, college presidents representing one hundred eleven predominantly black colleges in the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education issued a statement charging that the Nixon administration indicated little interest in the aspirations of black youngsters. In the charge, the presidents differentiated Dr. Allen from the administration. The association stated that Dr. Allen's commitment to higher education for the poor and minorities was not questioned. However, the college presidents specifically stated: "There is continuing conflict between the words of different members of the administration and between its official words and actions as they bear on the aspirations of Black Americans."¹²

Rhetorical Strategy

The civil rights rhetoric of James Allen was a rhetoric of dissent. Allen's rhetoric on desegregation was perceived as dissenting from the position enunciated by the Nixon-Agnew administration. Allen's dissent was maintained in a moderate rhetorical perspective. His strategy was a strategy of moderation. The strategy of moderation characterized Allen's public communication concerned with integration of schools. The basis for this strategy appeared to be fourfold. First, Allen attempted to depict himself as a professional educator; second, Allen attempted to promote his position as educationally and socially defensible; third, Allen attacked the segregationist position as unrealistic and educationally unsound, and fourth, Allen attempted to establish his position as consistent with legislative acts, Supreme Court precedents, and democratic principles.

Rhetorical Conclusions

James Allen was faced with difficult rhetorical decisions. As United States Commissioner of Education, it was imperative for him to speak on the issues of civil rights, integration of schools, and busing. Allen's rhetoric was characterized as dissenting from that of the Nixon administration's campaign promises. It eventually lead to Allen's being fired by Richard Nixon.

The major thrust of the speech called for the establishment of an American form of Kenya's Mau Mau. Using Raymond Yeager and Jerald L. Banninga suggested frame of logical reference selected parts of Malcolm's speech will be discussed.

Yeager and Banninga wrote: "While speakers only rarely use arguments which are in themselves syllogisms, they frequently use arguments that are based on syllogisms."¹² The syllogism that Malcolm X appeared to use as a basis for his reasoning seemed to take the form of a hypothetical enthymeme and was rhetorically effective.

American Idealism

Idealism tends to stand out as a characteristic of the American temperament. Alexis de Tocqueville, the French diplomat, over 150 years ago reported in his notes on American travel (Democracy in America (1835) concerning America's "taste for physical well-being" and the pursuit of equality and perfectibility. American society has had a perpetual need to improve the lives of individuals by solving social problems and altering public opinion through oral communication. Searching for a solution to the societal problems of equal rights, abortion, homosexuality, drugs, civil rights, etc., is an ongoing pursuit. During any one year, in any city in America, there is some issue that needs to be resolved and there is some person or group who will support the resolution of the existing issue even though it appears insoluble.

Father Groppi

In the late 1960s, Father James Edward Groppi dedicated a facet of his life to the plaguing issue of equal rights for the black people of Milwaukee. Father Groppi was a Caucasian and an assistant pastor at the St. Boniface Catholic Church.

On July 28, 1969, I talked with Father Groppi about his parish agenda. His voice sounded tired and I visualized him as being a much older man than his 38 years. However, as he talked about his quest, his voice tonality echoed with enthusiastic determination and living excitement. "I will picket with the Negro. I will go south with him. I will go to jail with him, and I will hang with him if it need be."¹³

When I asked if copies of his speeches were available he said that he had nothing published at that time. Thus, excerpts of his speeches were taken from newspapers. Groppi has a predominantly black congregation in the heart of the city's "Inner Core" or black ghetto. His quest to bring about equal rights led him to participate in the famous march in Selma.¹⁴ According to Groppi, his empathy with the Blacks began when he observed the treatment of fellow students at St. Francis Seminary where he studied for the priesthood. Groppi notes, "I saw instances of discrimination that were really horrible. I suffered with them then and I have never stopped suffering."¹⁵ He recalls that he was "ostracized" for refusing to attend a minstrel show during his deacon year.¹⁶ When Father Groppi was

asked if he did not consider his own civil rights activities a breach of clerical ethics, he replied: "Christ was not a peaceful, meek type of individual. He caused a great deal of conflict."¹⁷ Groppi claims that there is little distinction between his civil rights marches and his pastoral duties.

As a pastor I'm obligated to minister to the needs of the people I serve, and if those people need freedom from discrimination, segregation, and exploitation, then that deems my pastoral responsibility. To preach pie in the sky and to do nothing about the knife in a man's back is hardly Christianity.¹⁸

Reviewing the Situation

Groppi became more of a messiah than an advisor to the Youth Council of the Milwaukee chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP).¹⁹ The demonstrations in Milwaukee initially erupted when Father Groppi led the NAACP Youth Council in picketing Judge Cannon's house to protest the Judge's membership in the Fraternal Order of Eagles--an order that specifically excludes non-Caucasians. Groppi contends that a judge cannot fairly judge blacks and whites if he belongs and believes in an organization that bars blacks. The order, which has 5,400 members is the second largest local chapter in the nation. Membership is regarded as an important asset for candidates for public office. Groppi affirms:

Here is the power structure that determines what happens in the inner city. Everyone in power belongs to this club, which excludes Negroes. Housing, education and employment are all affected by their decisions.²⁰

Groppi asked a group of white religious leaders, "How would you feel if you had to go before a judge who had a black face and belonged to the Black Muslims?"²¹ The National Guard was called to protect Groppi's Council and hold back a surging, heckling crowd of 2,000 white youths.²² Father Groppi argued that the Fraternal Order of Eagles which restricts membership to Caucasians symbolizes "every phase of the Negroes' struggle for equality."²³ He emphasized that the youths who had picketed and had taken part in the civil rights demonstrations had for the first time walked five blocks through areas of expensive homes and had seen "what things are like on the other side of the street."²⁴

There was hope and desire in their eyes. They know what a slum is like. They know they are being deprived of decent housing, but they also know how they'd be received if they moved into one of these fancy neighborhoods.²⁵

In 1967, the Milwaukee Council rejected an open-housing ordinance for the fourth time in two years. Groppi stated that Milwaukee was the most segregated city in the North.²⁶ Father

Groppi revealed at an open-housing rally that ninety-five percent of Milwaukee's 86,000 blacks lived in the city's inner-city or its fringes, and he told the crowd: "We're coming off the reservation. We're going to live where we want. Either we get what we want or we're going to turn the city upside down."²⁷

Outside Interest Groups Incensed

Events moved rapidly to a climax in the summer of 1967. Unknown to Father Groppi and his peaceful NAACP Council of marchers, a roving band of blacks started a rampage of setting fires, smashing windows, looting stores and sniping. Forty-eight hundred Guardsmen were called and a (round-the-clock) curfew was declared by the Mayor.²⁸ Milwaukee, a city of 750,000 was sealed off from traffic. Factories, stores, taverns, liquor stores, gasoline stations, playgrounds, movie theaters, restaurants, county parks, pools and beaches were closed. Bus lines were stopped; cabs were ordered off the streets, and no mail was delivered. All classes at Marquette and the University of Wisconsin were canceled. Plane and train passengers from other cities were warned that they would find no local transportation available. The city was virtually motionless.²⁹ After 26 hours, the curfew was lifted during daylight hours only.

"A Battle for the Nation's Conscience"³⁰

On the twentieth consecutive day of protest, about two hundred out-of-state clergymen began to arrive in the city. The

clergy came in response to appeals by Father Groppi and the Milwaukee Youth Council. In a sermon at St. Boniface, Groppi pointed out to his integrated audience that the black leadership was eager for all the white aid possible, "This is not a struggle between black and white, but between right and wrong."³¹ In a sermon and on the television program "Face the Nation", he revealed that he had been widely criticized as jeopardizing the dignity of the church with nightly freedom-shouting rallies in the sanctuary. But he said that those rallies are "beautiful prayer meetings" held in the cause of social justice.³²

To make Christianity relevant today, the church should be the most radical civil rights organization in the country. . . . Jesus was the most radical civil rights leader we ever had, one who was nailed to the cross because of his work for social justice.³³

Father Groppi said that religion has become irrelevant when Christians fail to see in blacks--barred from access to living quarters--"the faces of Mary and Joseph, for whom there was no room in the inn."³⁴

When the police chief told city officials that the city was paying up to \$25,000 daily in overtime pay for policemen, there was a petition to restrict marches.³⁵ However, Groppi was quick to retort, "If you don't want us to resort to the gun and the bullet and the brick, then you had better not tamper with our right to free speech."³⁶

Father Groppi was invited to President Johnson's National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Here he strongly recommended cutting off all federal funds to Milwaukee and other cities "which are still promoting segregation" in housing, education and employment.³⁷ At a news conference he said that there would be violence in Milwaukee unless an open housing law was passed:

We glorify the heroes of the American Revolution and forget the violence. Well, the black man in the American system today is suffering more than the early Americans did in the colonies. If the tactic which we call orderly procedure does not work, then maybe that black man is going to die, but he will die a man. . . . Black power is a redemptive force in the white community as well as the black community. Until the black man rescues himself from this position of continued begging, the white man is not going to respect him. And respect always precedes the beginning of brotherhood between people.³⁸

Economic Boycott

Despite a proclamation theme by Governor Knowles that this is "Wonderful Wisconsin Week; you will like it here," the annual meeting of travel agents was postponed because of the disorders.³⁹ Business was down thirty to thirty-five percent in restaurants, nightclubs and hotels. The sale of Schlitz beer was

reported to be off as much as fifty percent because of a boycott.⁴⁰ The director of City Economic Development said the demonstration had caused "almost inestimable damage to the reputation of the city."⁴¹ People are afraid to come to Milwaukee."⁴² An economic "Black Christmas boycott" was staged. By April 1986, the Milwaukee Common Council passed a strong open-housing ordinance that Father Groppi called "a significant victory."⁴³

Conclusion

Father Groppi had strong ethical appeal. He was "a good man speaking well." Although he was Caucasian, he was entitled to speak for and protect his black congregation. His logical appeal gave force to his arguments. Although Groppi incorporated emotional appeal, it was unlikely that the prejudiced audience heard it.

Julian Bond

Julian Bond was a prominent black orator in the civil rights movement in the late sixties. A reporter asked Bond if his speeches fell into different categories and he replied: "Two. That is, I have only two speeches that I give. The one that I give less frequently is about the two movements in this country--civil rights and peace. The other speech is a history of the movement, which I usually call "What next for the Negro?" or "Civil Rights--1960 to the Present Day. . . ."⁴⁴

The Ethos of the Speaker

In analyzing the means of invention in the speech that Bond delivered at Defiance College in April 1970, I share these observations.

His ethical appeal in regard to personal appearance, personality and character was excellent. Bond was boyishly handsome and so fair that he jokes that he once had to show his identification card to prove that he should not be served. He almost always dressed in conservative ivy league clothing. He had beautiful voice tonality and he spoke in a soft, interpersonal conversational manner utilizing dramatic pauses. He appealed to the young. He followed Aristotle's chief dimensions for classifying young people ". . . They are hopeful, optimistic, enthusiastic. . . . They tend to err in the direction of intensity and excess. . . . They prefer impulse to calculation."⁴⁵ The youth in Bond's audiences appreciated these remarks.

I admire the courage of anyone who burns his draft card. I admire people who take action, and I admire people who feel strongly enough about their convictions to take an action like that--knowing the consequences they will face.

I don't believe in that war in Vietnam. . . . I'm against

all war. . .and I don't think people ought to participate in it. Because I'm against war, I'm against the draft. . . ."46

Bond pointed out that he was "eager and anxious to encourage people not to participate in it (the war) for any reason they chose."⁴⁷ Bond failed to analyze the older members of his audience according to Aristotle's dimensions--"Men in the prime of life judge from facts, observe standards, honor and expediency."⁴⁸ His ethical appeal was diminished when he tampered with an inherent motive appeal, patriotism.

Pathos of the Speaker

Bond used quotations to incorporate emotional appeal in his favorite speech. The first quotation was from an 1842 Negro newspaper:

If war be declared, shall we fight with the chains upon our limbs? Will we fight in defense of a government which denies us the most precious rights of citizenship. . . .The states in which we dwell have twice availed themselves of our voluntary services and have repaid us with chains and slavery. Shall we a third time kiss the foot that crushes us. . . .No!⁴⁹

The next quotation cited is from Henry McNeal Turner's writings.

The black man cannot protect a country if the country doesn't protect him; and if, tomorrow, a war should arise, I would not raise a musket to defend a country

where my manhood is denied. . . . I will say this much to the colored man of Georgia, unless Georgia acknowledges that you are men and invests you with the rights pertaining to manhood.⁵⁰

His third quotation is from W.E.B. DuBois's writings in 1904:

I believe in the Prince of Peace, I believe that war is murder. I believe that armies and navies are at bottom the tinsel and braggadocio of oppression and wrong; and I believe that the wicked conquest of weaker and darker nations by nations white and stronger but foreshadows the death of that strength.⁵¹

The Logos of the Speaker

When Bond was refused his seat in the Georgia House of Representatives, he found it quite sobering, and his outlook seemed to change.⁵² He became more mature after he was finally seated in the Georgia House, tending to be more selective in word choice and speaking less impulsively. The emotional appeal used in his speech at Bowling Green on November 22, 1968, was convincing and observable.

We're first-class citizens on the battlefield but second class citizens at home. . . .The war puts young black men into integrated fox holes next to young white boys, but this nation with all of its military might cannot seat them together in the public schools.⁵³

Bond utilized reasoned, extrinsic proof in this speech.

First we must realize, that although we have won certain kinds of rights--political and civil rights, the granting of those rights has been nearly useless for us. It is universally acknowledged that political and civil rights are hollow without economic rights, that economic and social rights without political and civil rights still may constitute slavery. And so our struggle goes on.⁵⁴

Conclusion

Bond's two speeches contained striking emotional and logical appeal; however, as he tampered with patriotism, his ethical appeal was reduced for some of his listeners.

Review in Light of Current Research

Recently, Stephan Lucas proclaimed that a renaissance of American public address was occurring.⁵⁵ The point of his proclamation seemed to be that the traditional approach to the study of public address, often referred to as the historical critical method, had become obsolete. Lucas noted that two recent developments were at the center of the resurgence of the study of American public address. The first is that consensus as a result of a definite communication strategy is of significant interest to scholars, and the methods of managing consensus--including formal public speaking are of vital interest to

communication scholars. The second major resurgent force was marked as a growing interest in the close analysis of rhetorical texts. Lucas commented, "While it would seem axiomatic that concern for their text-their composition, their generic features, their internal working, their cultural meaning, their social import-should be at the heart of the work in public address, such has not been the case historically."⁵⁶ Lucas goes on to make the case for textual studies and even "textual context."⁵⁷ Although the Lucas argument is a compelling one, echoes of training with Dr. Yeager urge caution. It is hard to deny the educational values of the historical critical principles addressed by Dr. Yeager. Dr. Yeager taught us the value of studying communication in context and that message-centered analysis was important but not exclusive. It is hard to forget Dr. Yeager's office with its posters of contemporary orators. The one representing the political emergence of Robert Kennedy is most vivid. Although Lucas claims that "hardly a glimmer of interest in confrontation as a communication strategy"⁵⁸ currently exists, somehow I feel it would be flickering, maybe blazing, in our professor's office in South Hall. The rhetorical confrontations of the Exxon boycott, the 1989 reapplication of the Nestle's boycott, and the implication of the mock trial of the People v. Fernald two months prior to the actual trial would spark some lively discussions.

Indeed, Lucas concluding his article observed, "Knowledge, is not subject to artificial boundaries of academic disciplines.

It is rather a tapestry upon which scholars of disparate backgrounds, methods, and interests weave their intricate special designs."⁵⁹ The special designs and contributions of those scholars devoted to textual analysis are valuable to the growing knowledge of public address, but so too is prior scholarship. Thus, this scholarship permits a study of contemporary oratory to be a lens for our time.

Notes

¹Kathleen Hall-Jamieson, Eloquence in an Electronic Age (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988) 30.

²Vera McCruter, "Malcolm X's Ideas Continue to Influence Students," The Lantern (The Ohio State University, No. 140) 19 May 1989: 3.

³Donald H. Smith, "Social Protest and the Oratory of Human Rights," Today's Speech, September 1967: 7.

⁴Smith 8.

⁵Raymond Yeager and Jerald L. Banninga, A Speaker's Guide to Syllogistic Reasoning (Dubuque, Iowa: W.C. Brown, 1967) 55.

⁶"Text of High Court Decision," New York Times 30 October 1969: 34.

⁷Fred P. Graham, "High Court Bids Six States Integrate by February 1," New York Times 18 January 1970: 1.

⁸Editorial, Dallas Times Herald, 15 February 1970: 38A.

⁹James Allen, Public statement, "The Obligation of the Educator With Respect to School Desegregation," March 1970.

¹⁰U.S. Congress, Senate, Senator Strom Thurmond speaking against the nomination of James Allen, Jr., 91st Congress, 1st sess., Congressional Record, CXV 11409, 5 May 1969.

¹¹James Allen, "Integration is Better Education," exerpt, "Meet The Press," found in Integrated Education September-October, 1969: 30.

¹²Paul Delaney, "Nixon's Commitment to Negroes Questioned by Black Educators," New York Times 16 April 1970: 43.

¹³"A Picketing Priest," New York Times 30 August 1966: 31.

¹⁴"The Pulpit v. the Bench," Time, LXXXVIII September 1966: 23.

¹⁵New York Times 7 September 1967: 31, col 3.

¹⁶New York Times 7 September 1967.

¹⁷Time LXXXVIII 9 September 1966: 23.

¹⁸New York Times 30 August 1966: 31 col 3.

¹⁹New York Times 30 August 1966.

²⁰New York Times 4 September 1966: 50 col 6.

²¹"Groppi's Army," Time 15 September 1967: 25.

²²New York Times 29 August 1966: 1 col 2.

²³Paul J. Weber, "Groppi's War on Milwaukee," America 30 September 1967: 342-343.

²⁴"Miracle in Milwaukee," Ebony November 1967: 29-36.

²⁵"Target for Hate," Newsweek 2 October 1967: 67.

²⁶New York Times 25 June 1967: 50 col 3.

²⁷"Where a White Priest Led Negro Defiance," United States News 11 September 1967: 16.

²⁸New York Times 1 August 1967: 18 col 1.

²⁹"Why a Racial Explosion Threatens Milwaukee," United States News 25 September 1967: 24.

³⁰New York Times 17 September 1967: 41 col 1.

³¹New York Times 18 September 1967: 36 col 4.

- ³²New York Times 18 September 1967.
- ³³New York Times 18 September 1967.
- ³⁴"Too Far to Stop," Newsweek 18 September 1967: 32.
- ³⁵New York Times 13 December 1967: 94 col 1.
- ³⁶New York Times 19 September 1967: 28 col 3.
- ³⁷New York Times 22 September 1967: 38 col 1
- ³⁸"Support for Ajax," Time 22 September 1967: 84.
- ³⁹New York Times 19 September 1967: 28 col 3.
- ⁴⁰New York Times 8 October 1967: sec VIIi: 1 col 1.
- ⁴¹New York Times 8 October 1967.
- ⁴²"Father Groppi, Dissenter," The Catholic World, CCVI
December 1967: 98.
- ⁴³New York Times 1 May 1968: 21 col 1.
- ⁴⁴"Representative," New Yorker 43 (1 April 1967): 34-35.
- ⁴⁵Lane Cooper, The Rhetoric of Aristotle (New York:
Appleton-Century Crofts, 1932) 132-33.
- ⁴⁶"The Infamous Mr. Bond," Saturday Evening Post 240 (May
1967): 94-96.
- ⁴⁷"The Infamous Mr. Bond."
- ⁴⁸Cooper 136-37.
- ⁴⁹"Representative," New Yorker.
- ⁵⁰"Representative," New Yorker.
- ⁵¹"Representative," New Yorker.
- ⁵²Cleghorn, R., "No Seat For the Negro Who Won," New
Republic 29 January 1966; 11-12.

⁵³Julian Bond, "What Next For the Negro or Civil Rights--1960 to the Present Day," Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH, 22 November 1960.

⁵⁴Bond, "What Next."

⁵⁵Stephen E. Lucas. "The Renaissance of American Public Address: Text and Context in Rhetorical Criticism" The Quarterly Journal of Speech May, 1988 p. 241.

⁵⁶Ibid p. 246.

⁵⁷Ibid p. 246-257.

⁵⁸Ibid p. 243.

⁵⁹Ibid p. 257.